REMARKS

Initially, the applicants would like to thank the undersigned for the courtesies extended to Kerry S. Culpepper during the in-person interview of June 8, 2011. During the interview, the parties discussed the above amendments and the following remarks. Accordingly, the present submission can be considered applicants' substance of the interview.

Claims 5 and 7-8 have been amended. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim 5-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0161615 to Tsumagari *et al.* (hereafter: "Tsumagari"). For the reasons discussed below, these claims, as amended, are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 recites *inter alia* that the playback apparatus includes *inter alia* an event manager operable to, when an event is generated in response to a user operation in the virtual machine mode, judge whether or not to cause the application to process the event, and when a result of the judgment is affirmative, further operable to output one of key events so as to cause the application to process the event, and when the result of the judgment is negative, cause the playback control engine unit to process an operation corresponding to the event. The judgment by the event manager is made by judging whether or not the event has been registered with the event registration information associated with the application that is executed by the virtual machine.

Tsumagari describes the DVD-Video playback engine 200 outputting a PTT event to the event/command handler 320, which holds it as an ENAV event. An ENAV interpreter 330 checks the held ENAV event to determine if it corresponds to ENAV content which is ready to

be played back (see paragraph [0257]).

In the office action, in the portion entitled "Response to Arguments" the examiner has asserted that the portion in Tsumagari which describes event/command handler 320 storing the PTT event as an ENAV and the ENAV interpreter 330 checks the held ENAV event to determine if it corresponds to ENAV content which is ready to be played back discloses "any key event that is indicated as having been registered with the event registration information can be processed by the associated application" as called for in claim 5.

However, in Tsumagari the PTT event is output and held by the event/command handler 320 at the beginning of each chapter *regardless* of whether or not it corresponds to ENAV content. That is, assuming *arguendo* that storing/holding the PTT event discloses registering the event as asserted in the office action, because in Tsumagari the PTT event is registered at the beginning of every chapter regardless of whether or not it corresponds to ENAV content, Tsumagari clearly fails to describe judging whether or not to cause the application to process the event based upon whether or not the event has been registered with the event registration information associated with the application that is executed by the virtual machine.

Claim 5 recites *inter alia* operations of the event manager when an event is generated in response to a user operation *in the virtual machine mode*. In comparison, in Tsumagari, the PTT events are output while the DVD-Video playback engine has already started playing back the DVD-Video. The asserted registration does not occur during user operation in the virtual machine mode. In comparison, in claim 5, the operation manager instructs the playback control engine unit to perform an AV function corresponding to the event when the result of the judgment is negative (the event is not registered). Tsumagari fails to disclose an operation manager that instructs the playback control engine unit to perform an AV function corresponding

9

to the event when the result of the judgment is negative (the event is not registered).

Therefore, because Tsumagari fails to disclose (1) judging whether or not to cause the application to process the event based upon whether or not the event has been registered with the event registration information associated with the application that is executed by the virtual machine (2) an operation manager instructing the playback control engine unit to perform an AV function corresponding to the event when the result of the judgment is negative (the event is not registered) and (3) when the result of the judgment is negative, the management step causes the computer to perform an operation step of causing the playback control step to perform an AV function corresponding to the event, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 5, as well as dependent claims 6 and 9-10 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 7-8 recite "judging whether or not the event has been registered with the event registration information associated with the application that is executed by the virtual machine…and when the result of the judgment is negative, the management step causes the computer to perform an operation step of causing the playback control step to perform an AV function corresponding to the event." Accordingly, the rejection of claims 7-8 should be withdrawn for at least the above-mentioned reasons with respect to claim 5.

Claims 11-12 depend from claims 7-8. Therefore, claims 11-12 should be in condition for allowance for at least the above-mentioned reasons with respect to claims 7-8.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kerry S. Culpepper Reg. #45,672/
June 14, 2011

Kerry S. Culpepper
Reg. No. 45,672

Panasonic Patent Center
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: 202-912-3800
Fax: 202-912-0774
Customer No. 42212